

There are such warnings on a variety of dangerous products, from iodine up and down the spectrum. There should be a warning on cigarette packages. I cannot see how we can expect success in our efforts to build sound behavior patterns on cigarette smoking among the young unless the Congress takes this step—and demonstrates the Government's recognition of the danger of cigarette smoking.

May I emphasize the fact that we feel in the American Cancer Society that governmental recognition, official recognition of this problem, is critically important, and this is one of the things that labeling will accomplish.

Now in the two bills we are discussing there is some difference in the additional material which is to be added on cigarette packages. S. 547 refers to "incriminated agent" and says that the average yield of each as determined by the Federal Trade Commission to contribute to the medical hazards of smoking must be listed. S. 559 requires a statement of the average tar and nicotine yield.

Either of these provisions seem to me excellent. I do want to make it clear that for 5 years the American Cancer Society has urged that the tar and nicotine content in the main stream of tobacco smoke be labeled. Our thinking is as follows: Unfortunately, there are many people now so strongly addicted to cigarette smoking that they find it impossible to give up the habit even though they earnestly desire to do so.

These people wish to smoke the least harmful cigarette available on the market, and I think the filter sales have reflected this. At the present time there is no satisfactory way for the consumer to judge the relative merits of different brands of cigarettes from the point of view of tar and nicotine. And there has been a change in this situation recently with the development of effective tests that have been accepted by the Bureau of Standards as being reliable indications of tar and nicotine content. However, there is evidence from the Cancer Prevention Study of the American Cancer Society, in which we are following 1,000,000 persons for 6 years, that people who smoke cigarettes low in nicotine and tar content cough less than people who smoke cigarettes high in nicotine and tar. A continued cough, we have found, is a danger signal that may point to lung cancer. A number of scientists feel that it is likely that low-tar, low-nicotine cigarettes may be less seriously harmful than other cigarettes.

I can see no sound reason for not requiring cigarettes to give the tar and nicotine content, and I see many possible advantages. We require labeling of content on a great variety of products, why not on cigarettes?

However, the label on packages is not enough—it is imperative, as this bill provides, that every radio and television commercial, every advertisement, carry a statement like this:

Caution—Habitual Cigarette Smoking is Injurious to Health.

This explanatory tag for commercials is not unlike that required today on political advertisements when individuals are running for public office. There is a difference in the degree of danger involved, however. [Laughter.]

A protective advertising label will put the individual on the alert, reminding him again and again of the serious threat to health in

cigarette smoking. The thing of cigarettes—as has it will make clear to all smoking cigarettes.

There is no disagreement, I think, that advertising in the cigarette industry and the men and women of the Once the habit has been maintenance.

However, candidly, I immediately reduce the cigarette. Its main value—like the who are not cigarette smokers there are so many pressures to give official government smoking.

Now, while I have been cigarette code, I cannot warning to smokers will be. It is good that professional

The tobacco industry is an adult habit—I recognize that young people's great smoking is a sign of mass appeal. We can help educational programs but we cigarette packages. He opposing those measures Federal Trade Commission supervision of advertising.

Defenders of doing no like this: "Can we intervene just because there is a risk about alcohol, how about

How about them indeed? Alcohol causes death and diseases, and particularly

the producers and the laws against the sale dangerous, but cigarettes to recommended amount

The comparison between the mobile industry tried to through Times Square protest. This is what suspension of cigarettes by public warnings agreed and with the enthusiasts smoking should be suppressed

In conclusion, may I we face? There is a risk affected, that after all,

1005072644